United States Patent and Trademark Office

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/244,291	02/03/1999	STEPHEN LEWALLEN	ST9-98-083	3591

21127   7590   11/12/2003

KUDIRKA & JOBSE, LLP
ONE STATE STREET
SUITE 800
BOSTON, MA 02109

EXAMINER
HO, THE T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2126	15

DATE MAILED: 11/12/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/244,291	LEWALLEN, STEPHEN
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	The Thanh Ho	2126	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>23 October 2003</u> .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-36* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-36* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed 10/23/2003.

2. Claims 1-36 have been examined and are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Atkinson U.S Patent No. 6,263,379 in view of Koppolu U.S Patent No. 6,460,058.

As to claim 1, Atkinson discloses a memory (memory, line 42 column 14), an

existing directory service (user's home directory, line 34 column 27); a moniker object (a

moniker, line 57 column 10) contains an identifier (an identifier object, line 57 column

10) that universally identifies (identify, line 58 column 10) an instance of the distributed

object (the linked data, line 58 column 10) and a moniker name (path name, line 64

column 11). However, Atkinson does not explicitly teach substituting the moniker object

for the distributed object.

Koppolu discloses a first stream object (BindToObject of IMoniker interface 124,

lines 65-66 column 14) substitutes the moniker object (moniker 120, line 64 column 14)

for the distributed object (named object 80, line 1 column 15) during the streaming of

the distributed object out from the memory (40, Fig. 1) to the local storage (42, Fig. 1)

so the moniker object is stored in the local storage in place of the distributed object (the

moniker can be stored and loaded from the secondary storage, lines 59-63 column 14;

line 64 column 14 to line 14 column 15). It would have been obvious to apply the

teachings of Koppolu to the system of Atkinson because this provides seamless

navigation between multiple document types and applications in a given Internet

browser as disclosed by Koppolu (lines 21-30 column 3).

As to claim 2, Koppolu further discloses the first stream object substitutes the

moniker object for the distributed object when the distributed object is persisted (lines

36-65 column 33). It would have been obvious to apply the teachings of Koppolu to the

system of Atkinson for the same reason discussed in claim 1 above.

As to claim 3, Atkinson as modified further teaches a second stream object

(IPersistStream, line 37 column 14) automatically substitutes a reference to the

distributed object for the moniker object (lines 38-65 column 14) during the streaming of

the moniker object (a moniker, line 41 column 14) in from the local storage (from the

persistent storage, line 42 column 14) to the memory (loaded into memory, line 42

column 14) so the reference is created in memory in placed of the moniker object.

As to claim 4, Atkinson as modified further teaches the second stream object

substitutes the moniker object for the distributed object when the distributed object is

resurrected (lines 66 column 14 to line 21 column 15).

As to claim 5, Atkinson as modified further teaches life cycle services are provided by associating with the moniker object a predefined policy specifies how and when life cycle services are performed (CODE TABLE 4A, column 22).

As to claim 6, Atkinson as modified further teaches a life cycle services object (CreateGeniricComposite, line 37 column 22) responds to the predefined policy by controlling the life cycle of the distributed object.

As to claim 7, Atkinson as modified further teaches a runtime repository includes a database (link 602, line 15 column 14) of moniker name-object reference pairs (CLSID_FileMoniker, and Q3.CHT, lines 17-18 column 14).

As to claim 8, Atkinson as modified further teaches a directory service factory object responds to the moniker name (invokes the function CreateInstance, lines 34-35 column 14) by instantiating a directory service adapter object (to create an instance of an object of class CFileMoniker, lines 35-36 column 14) for applying the moniker name to the existing directory service when the runtime repository does not contain the moniker name (lines 36-47 column 14).

As to claim 9, Atkinson as modified further teaches the distributed object is instantiated (it first instantiates a moniker object, lines 19-20 column 14) in accordance with an object model (of type CLSID_FileMoniker, lines 20-21 column 14); an object model adapter processes (requests the moniker to load its persistent data... lines 21-23 column 14) distributed objects.

As to claim 10, Atkinson as modified further teaches the object model adapter returns a reference to the distributed object together with a moniker object (requests the

moniker to bind to the file indicated by the loaded data, lines 22-23 column 14) associated with the distributed object.

As to claims 11-20, note the discussions of claims 1-10 above, respectively.

As to claims 21-30, note the discussions of claims 1-10 above, respectively.

As to claims 31-32, Koppolu further teaches storing the distributed object in a persistent repository (40, Fig. 1) different and located remotely from the local storage (42, Fig. 1). Note the discussion of claim 1 for reasons of combining references.

As to claims 33-34, note the discussions of claims 31-32 above.

As to claims 35-36, note the discussions of claims 31-32 above.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argued that Koppolu reference does not teach substitution of the moniker object for another object (Remarks, lines 1-2 page 10). In response, Koppolu discloses (line 55 column 14 to line 14 column 15) two functions of moniker 120: BindToObject and BindToStorage which client can call to bind to object 80 wherein BindToStorage function instantiates the named object 80 onto an OLE storage stream. The moniker can be stored and loaded from the secondary storage (lines 59-63 column 14). The reference meets the limitation as claimed.

Applicant argued that Koppolu reference does not teach a process occurs during a storage and resurrection of an object (last paragraph page 10). In response, the

applicant argued limitations that are not disclosed in the claim language. The claim

discloses a process occurs when a distributed object is streaming from the memory to

the local storage. Koppolu reference teaches a process in which a distributed object

(named object 80, line 1 column 15) streaming out from the memory (40, Fig. 1) to the

local storage (42, Fig. 1) as disclosed in claim 1 rejection above. The reference meets

the limitation as claimed.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to The Thanh Ho whose telephone number is 703-306-

5540. A voice mail service is also available for this number. The examiner can

normally be reached on Monday – Friday, 8:30 am – 5:00 pm.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-

3900.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents

P.O Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or fax to:

- AFTER-FINAL faxes must be signed and sent to (703) 746 – 7238

- OFFICAL faxes must be signed and sent to (703) 746 – 7239

- NON OFFICAL faxes should not be signed, please send to (703) 746 – 7240

TTH
November 5, 2003

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100